MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Eighty-Third Session
March 28, 2025

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Venicia Considine at 8:03 a.m. on Friday, March 28, 2025, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 1 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [Exhibit A], the Attendance Roster [Exhibit B], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Chair
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva
Assemblymember Rebecca Edgeworth
Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Heather Goulding
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt
Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Drozdoff, Committee Policy Analyst
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Karri Hurwitz, Committee Secretary
Mary Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Henry Rosas, External Affairs Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada
Miles Dickson, President and CEO, Nevada GrantLab
Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Sasha Sutcliffe-Stephenson, representing HELP of Southern Nevada
Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence
Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Robin V. Reedy, Executive Director, National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada
Yoana Ontiveros, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance; and Henderson Chamber of Commerce
Daniel Corona, Communications Manager, Tahoe Rim Trail Association
Bradley Mayer, representing Raise the Future
Tom Clark, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra; and The Children's Cabinet
Woody Worthington, Senior Director of Government Affairs and Community Engagement, Green Our Planet
Roxanne DeCarlo, Executive Director, The Empowerment Center
Laura Meyer, Chief External Affairs Officer, Communities in Schools of Nevada
Char Frost, Chair, Clark Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board
Matthew Dang, Director of Grants, Analysis and Administration, The Center
Mimi Diebold, Director of Special Projects, The Just One Project
Joseph Engle, CEO, There is No Hero in Heroin Foundation
Jenny Fay, Community Engagement and Development Director, Olive Crest
Marco Rangel, Political Organizer, Make The Road Nevada
Kathryn Jacobs, President and CEO, Umbrella Bookkeeping
Peter Guzman, President, Latin Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada
Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Bri Schmidt, Program Associate, Silver State Equality
Carissa Pearce, Health Policy Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada
Emily Barney, Executive Director, DOULA CO-OP of Nevada
Lesley Pittman, representing Domestic Violence Resource Center
Trevor Macaluso, CEO, Eddy House, Reno, Nevada
Brian T. Begay, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Sean O'Donnell, Executive Director, Foundation for Recovery
Annette Magnus, representing Asian Community Development Council
Marco Rauda, representing Jobs for America's Graduates; and Green Our Planet
Marine Heath, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Wendy Madson, Executive Director, Healthy Communities Coalition
Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada
Antonio Ramirez, Government Affairs Director, Make the Road Nevada
Kelli Kelly, Advisor, Nevada Food Systems, Nevada Small Business Development Center
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation
Ronald Najarro, State Director, Americans For Prosperity Nevada
Eddie Diaz, Strategic Director, The LIBRE Initiative Nevada
Cristina Arroyo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez, Translator, Deputy Organizing Director, Make The Road Nevada
Samantha Silcox, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mariana Miranda, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cecilia Mendez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
LeRoy Peters, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada
Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Chandler Cooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Faridy Canales, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Marina Cerrano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Gaudencia Torrez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Isabel Pastrana, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Elizabeth Ortiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson
Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas
Joelle Gutman Dodson, Government Affairs Liaison, Northern Nevada Public Health
Nick Vassiliadis, representing Nevada Resort Association
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Berry Johnston, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Peter Saba, Senior Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Restaurant Association

Chair Considine:
[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Today, we are going to hear two bills, and we are hearing them out of order. We will hear Assembly Bill 442, which revises provisions relating to grants, followed by Assembly Bill 180, which revises

provisions relating to local governments. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 442. To present this measure we have Assemblymember Watts. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 442: Revises provisions relating to grants. (BDR 31-589)

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:
I represent Assembly District 15, right in the heart of Clark County, and it is my pleasure to present Assembly Bill 442 for your consideration today. I am also joined in southern Nevada by Henry Rosas with the United Way of Southern Nevada, and Miles Dickson with Nevada GrantLab.

To give you a quick overview, I am going to talk a little bit about why I brought this measure forward and why I think it is extremely important. Then my copresenters are going to provide some additional detail from their experience and work with the nonprofit sector. They will walk through the sections of the bill, then we will close and take any questions you may have. One other thing I do want to note for all of the members of the Committee is that out of respect for your time and understanding the limits that are on testimony today, there are many exhibits that have been submitted from nonprofits explaining exactly why this bill is important to them.

At its fundamental level, A.B. 442 is about making sure our state is a more responsive partner with our nonprofit sector in meeting the needs of our community. Nonprofits are a vital partner in providing services, whether it is education, health care, conservation, public safety, you name it. There are nonprofits out in the community helping go above and beyond what we can do in state government. They are supporting local governments and helping build stronger communities. But unfortunately, they have run into barriers when it comes to partnering with the state and receiving state grants to do that work.

We have heard many stories about folks who cannot get paid in a timely manner. We have also heard stories of people who cannot even pursue these grants because they do not have the cash on hand or the capital to do the work and then wait to get money reimbursed back from the state.

This bill looks to address that through two fundamental elements. One, it would allow nonprofits who meet certain requirements to get up to 25 percent of a grant advanced to them by the state to make sure they have the resources to get to work on the ground right away. The other portion of the bill requires prompt payment. Once a complete invoice has been provided from a nonprofit to the state, it needs to be paid within one month. Otherwise, interest would accrue on that because that is time that nonprofits have to struggle. They still have to make their payroll. They have already spent money delivering these services. We want to make sure that we are providing a more modern, accountable, efficient state government and that we are doing everything we can to be partners with the nonprofit sector in meeting the needs of our community. With that, I will turn it over to my copresenters in southern Nevada.

Henry Rosas, External Affairs Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada:
Thank you so much, Assemblymember Watts. I am very excited to be at what will always be the hardest-working Committee in the Nevada State Legislature to share a little bit more context on how we arrived to the solution today, and the work we have done to connect with both nonprofits and other stakeholders during the interim to arrive at A.B. 442.

This work started in 2023 [Exhibit C]. Submitted as an exhibit to the Committee is a study conducted by Nevada GrantLab [Exhibit D] showcasing the undersized, understaffed, and underfunded nature of the nonprofit sector compared to similarly sized regions. I will try to promptly summarize the multi-page report. I think as Assemblymember Watts mentioned, the last bullet on the slide here showing the inability of most nonprofits to cover more than three months of expenses; I think this is one of the more alarming points. But it also allowed us to delve into two distinct conversations, which the bill hopes to address.

On the one hand I am thinking about delayed reimbursement timelines [Exhibit C]. In December we conducted a study of the sector. We had about 150 responses. We heard from nonprofits of having to take lines of credit to meet payroll and deliver programs because of delayed reimbursements. About a quarter of those respondents said they have waited over 60 days for reimbursements from grants. That is one part of the conversation. Without adequate cash on hand and cash reserves, for many nonprofits it poses a challenge to have sustainable cash flows and services.

On the other hand, the second part of the conversation is acknowledging the startup costs that are associated with administering a program. For example, a child-care facility is not just the hiring of teachers and center directors, but it also may be retrofitting a facility so our tiniest learners can have a safe place to learn and grow. That is all part of the start-up cost to administering a program. That is a challenge for nonprofits as they work on very lean budgets, as we hear a lot in the state context, but that is also true for the nonprofit context as well.

Those two distinct conversations have allowed us to arrive at the solution we are here to present today. But the growth opportunity that we have identified over the interim as stewards of taxpayer dollars, how can we administer funding to our community more efficiently while maintaining these very strong accountability and transparency measures? We are very excited about this government efficiency piece of legislation that aims to do the two-pronged approach that Assemblymember Watts mentioned, allowing for essentially kind of kick-starting the work with some access to capital upon meeting very stringent requirements on the advance payment side. Then on the prompt payment side, having nonprofits have an expected timeline for when to receive reimbursement is essential for them to have concrete service delivery and being able to meet all of the operational expenses it takes to administer programs for our community.

Before I hand it over to my colleague from Nevada GrantLab, I want to just show my appreciation for the community feedback that we received. We have had many, many convenings, meetings, summits to learn from the nonprofit sector. This is really

a collaborative effort. We have the majority of our counties represented from a variety of sectors. You will see some of their letters of support [Exhibit E] on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), but you will also hear from some of them in the room in both Carson City and Las Vegas today. We are thankful for our state agencies that have been wonderful thought partners in this work. We know there is a little bit more work to do, but we are all very driven by this desire to be the best public servants that we can, the best stewards of funding, and making sure that we can meet the needs of our community as efficiently as possible. I will now turn it over to my colleague at Nevada GrantLab to do this section-by-section overview of the bill.

Miles Dickson, President and CEO, Nevada GrantLab:
I want to briefly acknowledge that there are three things that we are trying to accomplish with this legislation. One, is adopt and implement some of the lessons learned throughout administration of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) dollars. Two, is to align state statute with federal guidelines, which I am going to talk about in a moment. I think three, especially over the last couple of months, thinking about what Nevada can do that is within the state's control to increasingly streamline and simplify federal grant administration, especially as the prospect of doing so is increasingly challenging and unknown coming out of Washington, D.C.

On the federal side, I want to acknowledge that Title 2 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 200, commonly known as the Uniform Guidance, establishes uniform administrative cost and audit requirements for federal awards to all non-federal aid entities including those subawardees. What this bill is attempting to do is align state statute and actually codify statute such that Nevada is in alignment with the federal requirements.

In October of 2024, the Uniform Guidance received the most significant update it had in more than ten years. Part of the Uniform Guidance that I want to highlight here is section 200.305, which addresses federal payment processes. This requires timely payment and advance payment. Those are the core concepts included in A.B. 442. Without going into too much detail of the federal requirements, I will simply say that under 2 C.F.R., advance payments are now the default payment mechanism in certain circumstances. Those certain circumstances are not a low bar. They require things like subrecipient monitoring, clear demonstrations that justify both the advances necessary as well as all of the costs that are being requested are eligible and appropriate for the grant. In absence of the ability to offer advance payment, reimbursement payment continues to be the preferred method. Within that, it requires payment within 30 days.

Moving into the sections of the bill; sections 2 through 7, inclusive or definitions. I want to especially bring your attention to section 6, which defines a proper invoice. That is one that includes all the necessary information as well as backup. In order for an invoice to comply with 2 C.F.R. and presumably other state agency requirements, we want to make sure that proper invoices are correctly defined here to balance the responsibility for getting paid on time, of course with the state, but also with nonprofits themselves. The state can only process an invoice that actually includes the appropriate information submitted in a manageable way.

We want to make sure that throughout this legislation it balances the responsibility for prompt and advance payment opportunities between nonprofits and states. I want to flag section 6 as defining a proper invoice as the basis for payment as well as the basis for when that clock starts ticking relative to interest.

Section 8 is a policy declaration that the state will make payments within 30 days and make an advance payment when appropriate. Section 9 imposes interest on late payments at a rate that either the agency and grantee agree to in their subgrantee agreement, or if they have not reached an agreement or stated it in the contract, the prime rate in accordance with *Nevada Revised Statutes* 99.040. It also acknowledges in section 2 that interest should only begin accruing on the thirty-first calendar day after receiving a proper invoice. It provides various exceptions to the interest penalties. Importantly, that reflects some of the feedback we heard from agency staff, as Henry Rosas alluded to in discussion over the last six months to make sure that things like technical difficulties within the state's information technology (IT) system or closure for a weather event does not count against the state because those things are beyond their control.

Section 4 notes that interest must be paid from the operating accounts of the agency, not from the grant funds. Interest is not typically an allowable expense under a federal grant. This really requires that the interest penalty, if any, is accrued to be paid by the state agency, not billed back to the federal grant. Section 10 requires state agencies to review the invoice as soon as practical and if that invoice is not proper, again, the section 6 definition of proper is that the state has to notify a grantee within 14 calendar days of receipt of that invoice. This provides time for the agency to review the grant and hopefully get back to the subgrantee, again, within 14 days at most, to let them know that the invoice they received is not sufficient or not acceptable to process payment and notify them of the specific deficiencies, if any, within that invoice. Let me pause and say that all acknowledged are focused on prompt payment sides.

Moving on to advance payment. Section 11 enables a grantee to submit a request for advance payment on a form prescribed by the director of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor. It requires that grantees must demonstrate that a request is for eligible expenditures and activities, justify the advance request, describe the financial management's policies and procedures necessary to manage government funds, especially advanced funds. It requires various responsibilities that an entity, if approved, must comply with. It requires an entity to submit additional information requested by the state agency.

I want to note here that while it is not specifically phrased this way, I think this is the opportunity for state agencies to engage in the appropriate subrecipient monitoring assessments that are reflected in both 2 C.F.R. as well as state agencies' own practice. Again, state agencies are administering grants every day. Many of them have a good concept and good understanding of what they should be thinking about in terms of risk assessment. We are not trying to avoid very appropriate risk assessment of subgrantees. Section 4 allows for that. Section 5 directs agencies to provide an advance to the greatest extent practical. I want to note here that while we really think this is important, that is still permissive language that

allows for agency discretion. Finally, in section 6, it limits the amounts in advance depending on the source of funding, whether that is federal or state. Sections 6 through 8 requires notification and reporting to the Governor's Finance Office along with policy and procedure adoptions from the Board of Examiners.

I want to close by acknowledging the very hard work that state staff do often without the adequate personnel or IT infrastructure that this state really could and should have in place to manage grants. I think we all understand, both in state government, nonprofits, and perhaps in some cases in local government, we are still a ways off from what I think many of us across those three different organization types would like to have in terms of personnel and IT infrastructure to manage grants. I really just want to close by acknowledging state staff, thanking them for their work, and explain that what we are really trying to do is balance this complex process between state agencies and nonprofits in a way that really helps federal funding reach the communities and the people that it is intended to serve.

Assemblymember Watts:
I have just a couple of things in closing. This is an important issue to me personally as well. I had about ten years of experience working in nonprofits in the state and I will say, I definitely did not always have three months of operating reserves. I think a lot of the time I was happy to have one to two months of operating reserves. That just gives you a sense of how tight the margin is and the need to ensure that there are resources available for nonprofits to do the work that they do.

The other thing I want to emphasize is that while nonprofits are not-for-profit entities, they are private entities, and grants are a form of public-private partnership with the state. We want to make sure, the same way that we would not expect businesses to perform services and then wait for months on end to be paid for those services rendered, we should not expect that of our nonprofit community partners either.

I do want to note a couple of things. One, this did come out of things we realized during the pandemic. We had significant federal funds that we were able to then invest in nonprofits to help address some of the issues we saw in the community. But we also quickly saw that we were having trouble actually getting that money out the door. We heard from nonprofits that they did not have the ability to start spending significant amounts of that money and then wait for a reimbursement. We took steps with the ARPA dollars to make advances of that money. You saw in the presentation, there are other states that are moving in this direction. The federal government is moving in this direction. We have also moved in that direction with those funds specifically.

Now we want to codify that across the board for our state moving forward and we are having ongoing conversations. There is a lot of concern from state agencies, rightfully, that they do not want to be caught on the hook. One thing we want to make sure is that if they are a sub or a pass-through for a federal grant, and it is still on a reimbursement basis, they do not have to advance. We do not want, again, to have the state in the position where they have to wait for reimbursement now, but they are putting money out the door. There have definitely been

conversations as well to make sure—and I think we have attempted in this language to make sure that there has to be a robust plan in place. Somebody cannot just say, Please provide an advance. They have to have a detailed spending plan and they have to prove they have the systems in place to track and spend those dollars responsibly. With that, we thank you for your time, consideration, and are glad to answer any questions that the Committee may have.

Chair Considine:
Thank you for that presentation. We do have a couple of questions and we will begin with Assemblymember Karris.

Assemblymember Karris:
In all the touring I did of nonprofits, I could see where this is a great, great need. I want to thank you for the 16 exhibits that are not standard form letters; each and every one from a nonprofit is very heartfelt in explaining their need in this area [Exhibit E]. When you were going through deciding how the penalties would happen, did you collaborate with the state or is this something you took from other states that do this already?

Assemblymember Watts:
I will turn it over to my copresenters. I will say yes. There have been ongoing conversations with many state agencies as we have worked on the development of this policy. At first, we were looking at specifying an interest rate in statute. We modified that in conversations with different agencies. The goal is that interest does not accrue and that we can get these paid promptly. I am cautiously optimistic about the state's upgrade of its human resources and financial systems that will really help streamline and enable agencies to process these payments faster. But at the same time, if we do not have some teeth to this, if there is not a consequence, then it makes it very easy for it to be an aspiration that does not become reality. If my copresenters would like to add anything, I will turn it over to them.

Henry Rosas:
To echo Assemblymember Watts' remarks, one of the things that we also were trying to design during the interim was how do we match private sector practices, thinking of private contractors up to par with a sector. Those conversations on the interest rate penalty and what those look like on the private sector side were conversations that we hope to mirror here. But yes, to Assemblymember Watts' point, we are working with state agencies to find that middle-ground solution. We have incorporated some of their feedback already into this bill. Of course, we did look at other states to see what is best practice, but of course, always looking at Nevada and seeing what we do here for the private sector, and so that is part of the rationale for that portion of the bill as well.

Assemblymember Flanagan:
I have a lot of nonprofit experience, working with various agencies from The Tacoma Urban League to After-School All-Stars. On our side, the state's side, will they keep a database of certain programs that are already proven so that it makes it a little bit easier to establish these relationships with the funding support to the nonprofits in advance?

Assemblymember Watts:
We have a long list of things that we think we can and should do to support the nonprofit sector to help support them in seeking and expanding grant opportunities. This bill in particular has just focused on the aspects of how those grants are dispersed. Whether it is the Office of Federal Assistance—they have been working to help try and compile information and get that out to members of the community. I know that other agencies are trying to improve their outreach. I think that once there is a little bit more certainty, when nonprofits sign up, they will be able to access those funds in a timely and effective manner. That will increase the amount of interest. Frankly, we have heard from nonprofits that have been interested and they talked to others or looked into the details and said, Never mind, and did not apply for grants. There are also nonprofits who have gone through state grants and had a negative experience and decided not to continue on in those opportunities. If Mr. Dickson has anything to add in terms of Assemblymember Flanagan's question about compiling lists, I will turn that over to him.

Miles Dickson:
I am going to generalize a bit because I think the processes may vary a little bit from agency to agency. The majority of federal government grants are passed down through a request for proposal, or more specifically, a notice of funding opportunity announcement. The majority of grantees are going through often a competitive selection process in order to win those grants in the first place. Embedded within that are things like past performance. Grantees are often asked about their past performance, not just administering programs like this, but also administering government grants.

Within the award process—the procurement process—we have quite a bit of process that helps us understand organizations that are most ready and most competitive. In my experience, state agencies, state staff, whether they are at the agency or the program level or on the finance level, folks often have a considerable amount of experience, insight, and expertise of organizations that do really good work, both programmatically and on the financial management side. I would love to see in the future, as a state, being in a place where we have a better process of sharing that information across agencies so the state collectively, as well as other community partners, are able to best acknowledge the organizations that have really strong track records. I just want the Committee to know processes to evaluate organizations and their competencies are often embedded within the procurement process. I think that creates quite a bit of safeguard.

Assemblymember Kasama:
I used to audit a lot of nonprofit organizations. I totally understand your comments about the cash flow issues that many of them have. When I am looking at the bill, I actually have two questions or clarifications. You reference in two sections here, under section 11, it talks about reporting the interest that is earned on accounts. But unless I am missing it, it does not say what the intent of that is. You have the 25 percent advance. It talks about having to report the interest that is earned on the account if you do not reimburse it all. What is the intent of that interest? Is it to reduce that from following payments after that? Or is it just a data collection?

Assemblymember Watts:
I am going to turn that over to my copresenters down in southern Nevada.

Miles Dickson:
That is a great question, Assemblymember. You are right. The statute does not direct what the use of that is. I would expect the use of that to reduce future payment. Interest is intended to both be an enforcement mechanism as well as provide some sort of coverage or remuneration in the event that an organization incurs additional cost. As you may be familiar having audited nonprofits, sometimes organizations end up having to take loans. What we see is a nonprofit that may be facing a cash challenge that because it is waiting for grant reimbursement, it may tap into a line of credit. In most cases I can tell you the cost of that line of credit is going to exceed what is provided here in statute. Even if the nonprofit takes that line of credit and gets an interest payment from the state, it is still going to be in the red. Having said that, there could be a scenario, and I would probably leave it to the policies and procedures adopted by the State Board of Examiners to determine what the treatment of that interest is, but I think from my perspective, the interest paid to a state agency will often be used to offset their own cost of capital. Let me ask and confirm that answers your question.

Assemblymember Kasama:
I think if we have some clarification as to what the intent of that is. If I might proceed, one of the sections talks about, if all of the 25 percent is not used it would decrease some of the future payments. But I do not see an area here where, if it is found that the funds being used by the nonprofit are not being used correctly, what is the vehicle for it being returned to the State? Upon audit, should it find that—I think something regarding that needs to be addressed in here too. If it is not being used properly, it is returned to the state.

Assemblymember Watts:
My sense of why that might not be spelled out clearly in here is because that is already covered under grant agreements in general; the funds have to be utilized properly. If there is any misuse of funds, that would lead to various corrective actions including termination of the grant, and whatever other remedies are allowable. All of those policies would continue to be in effect. Same thing if that advance was not spent properly. Again, if it is not the worst-case scenario, then it is something that can be worked out. Essentially, until those funds get spent, they are not going to be able to come just because they have a payment schedule. They need to spend what they have been advanced before they come and seek additional funds via reimbursement. In a worst-case scenario we would still go after recovering any funds that may be available and terminating the grant.

Miles Dickson:
I think the Assemblymember is right. This bill builds on a pretty extensive existing body of statute, administrative code, and grant agreements that all address incorrect usage of funding. I think back to the idea of subrecipient monitoring and allowing agencies to still have discretion. There is an important role for evaluating an organization's capability to use especially advanced payment correctly. We are attempting to balance the objective of making advance payments available to the greatest extent practical and reserving agency discretion to

engage in really important subrecipient monitoring work. We do not want the state finding itself in a place of being obligated to advance funds to an organization that does not necessarily have the capabilities to manage it and potentially could incorrectly use them.

Assemblymember DeLong:
Based on your testimony, it sounds like you are having ongoing discussions with a number of state agencies. With that in mind, are you expecting an amendment to the language that is currently up on NELIS?

Assemblymember Watts:
I think there will probably be some amendment to the language. There are definitely ongoing conversations. Sometimes those conversations are about mutual understanding of the intent of the language and that does not always necessitate a change. Again, while we have worked with many agencies and have worked to make adjustments to the language, there probably will be some more tweaks needed along the way to address issues or help provide some additional comfort to agencies on issues they have brought up.

We are trying to strike this balance of charting a clear policy direction while maintaining a solid degree of discretion to the individual state agencies as they manage these funds. We are trying to strike that balance between not being overly prescriptive, because we want this to be an across-the-board policy, and going too far down into statutory language to address one agency's concern might not fit in other states. That is what we are attempting to work out. I think hopefully some of those things can be resolved through ongoing conversations, but there are potential amendments that we will be bringing forward as well.

Chair Considine:
Committee members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I want to thank you for your presentation and would like to move on to testimony on the bill. I would like to start with testimony in Carson City in person on Assembly Bill 442. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:
I am here today in support of Assembly Bill 442, as this bill would streamline the grant process for nonprofits in our state by increasing accountability and delivering grants in a timely manner. Nonprofits will be more secure in their funding, which will help them continue to provide their valuable services. The Chamber would like to thank the bill sponsor for bringing this forward and we thank the Committee for your time and support of A.B. 442.

Sasha Sutcliffe-Stephenson, representing HELP of Southern Nevada:
I am here today for HELP of Southern Nevada, which has proudly served the community for 55 years as one of the largest supportive housing organizations. We want to thank the sponsor for bringing this bill and the Committee for your consideration as it will help to ensure that nonprofits can continue to serve vulnerable populations without any risk of disruption.

Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada:
The Food Bank of Northern Nevada has been providing food security assistance for about 40 years now. We do not do this work alone. We have a partner agency network of 155 organizations in our 13 counties that we serve. Many of those are smaller nonprofits themselves that struggle to build the capacity to keep up with the need that we are seeing. We believe that this bill is a great step in the right direction towards bringing stability to the nonprofit sector. We thank the bill sponsors and all the stakeholders for the work that has gone into this. We ask you for your support.

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:
Our membership includes 14 agencies across Nevada who provide lifesaving services to victim-survivors. State grants and state funding are a critical piece of their budgets and their success. They use these funds to sustain 24-hour hotlines, put families in shelter, and meet basic needs such as shelter, housing, and transportation. Without stable funding, victim services lose access to these critical resources. I do want to note that in the past year our members have regularly had to wait for months after submitting appropriate invoices for contracted services. More than once that delay has crossed into different fiscal years, which has pushed their invoices to the category of stale claims, which require an entirely new reimbursement process. These delays interrupt organizations' ability to manage cash flow and meet the needs of victims. We are in favor of this bill.

Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:
I am here today in support of A.B. 442. We are supporting one of our partners today in Nevada GrantLabs who was very valuable and instrumental in University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) receiving a $2.1 million Build Back Better grant a couple of years ago. This grant was used for the UNLV Tourism Business Igniter that opened on the west side and eventually led to the microbusiness park that just had its groundbreaking last week. Obviously, relationships like this with nonprofits are very important for us at UNLV. This process and this bill, which speeds up that process and implementation for them, makes a lot of sense for us. We are very happy to support this today and thank you to Assemblymember Watts, The United Way, and Nevada GrantLabs for bringing this forward.

Robin V. Reedy, Executive Director, National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada:
I want to give you a couple of examples of how this bill would really help nonprofits in this state. I have been doing this for 16 years, 8 of them as a volunteer and 8 of them in my position currently. I will tell you the state has been as far behind as six months. Can you imagine being behind as a nonprofit of over $250,000 being owed and trying to make payroll?

Fortunately for us, we were able to raise the money, but sometimes it does mean one of our affiliates needs to borrow money and incur interest on it. Fortunately, the new systems that have been put in place appear to be working quite well and it is almost ahead of time. We are thrilled about that. But the cash flow for a nonprofit is incredibly important. One of our last grants required us to contract with two organizations to provide over 250 people trained in

crisis intervention. Each contract was $50,000. To put out $100,000 and wait even for the minimum of 45 days that it takes today is an incredible burden, and yet we provide fail-safe, filling the gaps that the state is unable to do. Thank you for considering this bill. We support it and we hope you do too.

Yoana Ontiveros, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance:
The Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance is the state's largest regional economic development agency serving all over Clark County. We thank the sponsors of the bill and the stakeholders such as Nevada GrantLab for bringing this proposal over.

Daniel Corona, Communications Manager, Tahoe Rim Trail Association:
We are in strong support of A.B. 442. First, I want to thank all of the bill's sponsors for championing this much-needed legislation. We would also like to give a special shout out to Assemblymember Watts, not just as a sponsor of A.B. 442, but as a thru-hiker of the Tahoe Rim Trail. Fun fact, he is No. 2,415 in our 165-mile club, having thru-hiked the Tahoe Rim Trail in 2019. His dedication to Nevada's public lands and now with A.B. 442 to its nonprofits is something we deeply appreciate.

At the Tahoe Rim Trail Association we are fortunate to be in a stable financial position, but we know many nonprofit organizations across Nevada are not. For smaller organizations, especially those operating on tight margins, delayed reimbursements or the inability to access upfront funding can make or break a program or even the organization itself. I have personally seen organizations have to scale back services, delay hiring, or take out loans just to cover basic operating costs while they wait for state payments. Assembly Bill 442 offers a real solution. By authorizing advance payments and requiring timely reimbursements, this bill ensures nonprofits can focus on what they do best: serving our communities instead of stressing over cash flow. Assembly Bill 442 is not just a financial fix. It is a policy that values equity, efficiency, partnership, and it ensures that state funds quickly reach the ground where they make the most difference. We urge your support for A.B. 442 and hope to see you out on the trail.

Bradley Mayer, representing Raise the Future:
Raise the Future is an adoption nonprofit that works with the hardest to place foster youth to find them permanency by partnering with state and local governments. We have an employee in Nevada who spends most of their time navigating the maze of the grants that fund us and the reimbursements that come along with it. This bill would go a long way to helping us and all the nonprofits really increase their efficiency in delivering the services they want and especially, with some of the upfront payment, being able to manage some of these startup costs that come along with enacting a new program. We thank the bill sponsor for bringing along and urge your support.

Tom Clark, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra; and The Children's Cabinet:
The United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra wants to thank our southern Nevada colleagues for championing this issue and bringing it forward, and of course, Assemblymember Watts for sponsoring the bill. The Children's Cabinet is a trusted intermediary for a lot of state grants that flow through down to the providers in the state. You can imagine when those services are provided but it takes months for that reimbursement, it can be very painful; not just for The Children's Cabinet, but also for those providers downstream. I am also here to testify that in December, The Children's Cabinet was actually given an advance on some of the work that it was doing because the state's computer system was down. Once that system came back up, the state was able to work with The Children's Cabinet, true up what those invoices were with that reimbursement. That system worked. This particular piece of legislation enables other nonprofits to be able to take care of that program. We believe that was the precedent and definitely proves that this process can work.

Woody Worthington, Senior Director of Government Affairs and Community Engagement, Green Our Planet:
Part of the largest school gardens in the nation and Nevada being one, we are one of many nonprofits across the state stepping up to meet critical community needs. From education and food access, to mental health and workforce development, nonprofits are often the first to respond and the last to leave, supporting some of the most impactful programs in Nevada. Assembly Bill 442 is a powerful step forward. By allowing upfront payments and requiring reimbursements within 30 days, it streamlines the grant process. Please support.

Roxanne DeCarlo, Executive Director, The Empowerment Center:
The Empowerment Center is a small nonprofit that supports women who suffer from addiction. I am here in favor of A.B. 442 specifically, because we have recently been awarded funding so that we could build a new Empowerment Center. Not receiving anything in advance of that has left the burden to us to be able to fund the project. Our first bill was for $1 million from our general contractor. We have worked it out, do not worry, the project is moving forward. But it just gives you a picture of the challenges that a small nonprofit experiences. We are right now in the process of seeking a line of credit to help us move forward throughout the two-year build process. Just to give you a real picture of what is happening out there, I thought it would be best that I come in person and speak this morning.

Chair Considine:
We are about halfway through our time. I am going to go down to Las Vegas, then the phones, and then, time permitting, will be back up here. Las Vegas, if you want to start with testimony in support of A.B. 442, please go right ahead.

Laura Meyer, Chief External Affairs Officer, Communities in Schools of Nevada:
I am providing testimony in support of A.B. 442. I want to ditto the reasons that everyone else has mentioned about the importance of this bill. This bill would not only impact the work that communities and schools do but also the over 120 nonprofit partners that we work

with across the state. A stronger nonprofit sector allows us to more effectively fulfill our mission to ensure that Nevada students have the support that they need to succeed. Thank you for your consideration and your support.

Char Frost, Chair, Clark Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board:
This was a topic that was front and center during the latter piece of last year. I am here in support of the bill on behalf of the entire Clark Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board. I just want to stress, in addition to all of that, that many of our mental health providers are nonprofits. We have been in a mental health crisis in the state for many, many years, not being able to get those funds to support our most vulnerable and our citizens who very much need these services that go all the way from mental health services to food security, housing security, so on and so forth. This is a bill that would improve the lives of Nevadans across the state.

Matthew Dang, Director of Grants, Analysis and Administration, The Center:
On behalf of The LGBTQ Center, I am here to express our strong support for A.B. 442, which seeks to authorize advance payments for state grants and establish property reimbursement policy. The LGBTQ Center is dedicated to being an intersectional affirming sanctuary where Nevadans can access essential services, and by empowerment, experience genuine upliftment and holistic, compassionate community space. Nonprofits like ours provide critical care and needed service, ultimately saving taxpayers' money with our program. However, at times this would come as a burden to our organization where we must wait to get reimbursed. I have heard nonprofits from recently established to recognized, bemoan the fact that they have had to take loans to pay for services while they are waiting for reimbursements. Some organizations did not take that route, could not perform the activities, and were publicly scolded by government granters where they explained they did not have the funding to do the work. With over 30 years of service to the community, we have seen firsthand the challenges that nonprofits like ours face when payments are delayed. We urge you to please pass A.B. 442.

Mimi Diebold, Director of Special Projects, The Just One Project:
I am here today to express our strong support for Assembly Bill 442. This is a critical step toward ensuring that nonprofit organizations can effectively carry out their missions without the unnecessary financial burdens. In just ten years, The Just One Project has grown from a volunteer-led community initiative to a leading community provider of food, housing, and social services. Our growth is in large part due to the ability to secure and rely on state grant funds, which help us provide vital services to southern Nevada.

At key points in the early history of our organization, we were fortunate enough to receive advance funds on large grants, which enabled us to hire new staff, purchase food, supplies, and expand our programs to meet urgent community needs. We continue to rely on the steady reimbursements to maintain our agency cash flow and the fiscal health of our organization. The Just One Project understands firsthand how vital advance payments can be for a small, new, or growing agency doing important work in our community. By passing A.B. 442, the State will help nonprofits continue their vital work more efficiently, proactively, and without

undue financial stress. It will empower organizations to better plan, allocate resources, and serve our communities without financial roadblocks. We thank the sponsors of the bill and commend the Legislature for prioritizing this issue. We urge swift passage of A.B. 442. The legislation will strengthen the nonprofit capacity, improve service delivery, and ultimately enhance the well-being of the Nevadans we all serve.

Joseph Engle, CEO, There is No Hero in Heroin Foundation:
I am here to express strong support for A.B. 442 [Read from Exhibit F.] Ditto to what everybody has said. I have been around for 12 years. We supply critical outpatient treatment for adolescents and adults experiencing substance use disorder and co-occurring mental health challenges. In summary, A.B. 442 recognizes that effective service delivery requires predictable cash flow. By supporting this bill, you are not only helping nonprofits with bookkeeping, you are ensuring vital services remain consistently available to those who need them most.

Jenny Fay, Community Engagement and Development Director, Olive Crest:
Olive Crest is working to end child abuse and neglect in southern Nevada since 1997. We are in support of this bill. We have experienced firsthand the need for this bill. While we are grateful for funding, the delay in payment has been challenging. For instance, this past year as a contracted family resource center, our services were expected to begin, and for our community, needed to begin July 1, but the contract was not finalized until October 18. This meant we were providing services for four months without reimbursement. Even as a very well-established organization, this was challenging for us.

Marco Rangel, Political Organizer, Make The Road Nevada:
I just wanted to ditto what everyone said before me. I strongly support A.B. 442.

Kathryn Jacobs, President and CEO, Umbrella Bookkeeping:
I am here in support of A.B. 442. We are an organization that provides fiscal services to over 40 nonprofit organizations throughout southern and northern Nevada. I see firsthand every day the challenges that nonprofits face in regard to cash flow and delayed reimbursement. I want to thank the sponsors for bringing this bill forward as it is certainly a step in the right direction. Ultimately, I feel that the efficiencies created under this bill would benefit the communities for which these funds are intended to support in the first place.

Chair Considine:
We will now move to the phone lines. Again, if you are on the phone in support of A.B. 442 and what you would like to say has already been said, please just state your name and say, ditto.

Peter Guzman, President, Latin Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I commend those who brought this forward. This is so important to the nonprofit organizations to continue the great work that they are doing. I think this is such a critical bill. Again, commend everyone who brought this forward and I am in full support as is the Latin Chamber of Commerce of this bill.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am representing the Nevada Disability Action Coalition. I want to take the opportunity to thank Assemblymember Watts, Miles Dickson, and all of the copresenters for this important bill. As a blind individual, I have used some of the nonprofits that have spoken before. I ride the bus a lot and I approach people when I hear the conversation needing assistance, so I connect them. But thank you so much for all that you guys do. Have a good day.

Bri Schmidt, Program Associate, Silver State Equality:
I am with Silver State Equality, a statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights nonprofit. Ditto to everybody else.

Carissa Pearce, Health Policy Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada:
We are in full support of this bill, and I would just say ditto to everyone who has given testimony.

Emily Barney, Executive Director, DOULA CO-OP of Nevada:
The DOULA CO-OP of Nevada is an emerging nonprofit in the state. Ditto, ditto, ditto, ditto, everything that my nonprofit colleagues have said in this testimony. This is an incredibly important bill and I am in strong support of A.B. 442.

Lesley Pittman, representing Domestic Violence Resource Center:
I am calling in support of A.B. 442 on behalf of the Domestic Violence Resource Center in northern Nevada. In the interest of time I will say ditto to what the others in support testimony have said. Have a good day.

Trevor Macaluso, CEO, Eddy House, Reno, Nevada:
We are a nonprofit serving homeless and at-risk youth throughout northern Nevada. I would just echo what a lot of my colleagues around the state have said. We have also experienced payments owed that have exceeded a six months' time. Unfortunately, those cash reserves we have had to spend on that is funding we could have used to expand services and operations in other ways to achieve our mission and vision as an organization. We would register full support of this bill.

Brian T. Begay, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a lived experience consultant with the Southern Nevada Lived-X Team. I just want to ditto everything that my other nonprofit colleagues had said earlier in their testimonies. I am in strong support for A.B. 442. I want to thank the sponsors of this bill. I want to thank you for your time and consideration and looking into this bill. [Exhibit G was also submitted.]

Sean O'Donnell, Executive Director, Foundation for Recovery:
We are a public charity that has been providing no-cost recovery support, transportation assistance, and housing programs for Nevadans impacted by substance abuse disorder and overdose for 20 years. We are in strong support of A.B. 442 and I would just like to say ditto to all the previous testimonies of support. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Annette Magnus, representing Asian Community Development Council:
I am here today for my client, the Asian Community Development Council. I am here to support A.B. 442. This bill is critical and I would like to say ditto to the rest of our colleagues.

Chair Considine:
We are already over time. If the two folks still here in Carson City wanted to say something quickly and get on the record, go ahead.

Marco Rauda, representing Jobs for America's Graduates; and Green Our Planet:
We want to thank the Chair, the sponsors, the cosponsors, and the Committee for bringing this bill forward. I want to thank United Way and the Nevada GrantLab for allowing me to work on this bill as well.

Marine Heath, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am Assemblymember Watts' intern and a student at University of Nevada, Reno, but I am just speaking on my own behalf. My father was diagnosed with early-onset dementia and we have used nonprofits for a lot of resources. I am in strong support for this bill.

Chair Considine:
We will now move on to testimony in opposition. If opposition goes longer than the 20 minutes, I will put this time on that we have gone over in support. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 442? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 442? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the lines wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 442?

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I like most of the bill. However, the rule says that if there is something you do not agree with, you have to testify in opposition. I applaud all the work the nonprofits are doing. What I disagree in the bill are the penalties. Because of the penalties, they are going to be paid again by the taxpayers. I do not mind penalties, but the penalties should be attached to the people who are not doing the appropriate job or are slowing things down. When penalties are not attached to the person, the person is not having the incentive to do any better. When we, the taxpayers, are going to pay the penalties, what incentive is that to the person to do any faster job? That is the only thing I disagree with that bill.

I hope that you figure out a way to actually penalize the person. If it is not money, maybe in the motion or something that it goes through, something that is attached to the person. If they are in jeopardy of losing their job, if they misbehave or do not do their job on time, take too many coffee breaks, whatever the case is. But if you really want it to work, the penalty should be attached to the person that is doing the job, not to the taxpayers. Thank you for everything all these nonprofits are doing and all the other nonprofits around town, in the state, in the country, and thank you for trying to make it better for the nonprofit. Have a lovely day.

Chair Considine:
We will now move on to testimony in the neutral position. Is there anyone here on Assembly Bill 442 wishing to testify in neutral in Carson City? Go ahead when you are ready.

Wendy Madson, Executive Director, Healthy Communities Coalition:
We are a certified substance use nonprofit doing business for 30 years, serving your rural Lyon and Storey Counties, located about 10 miles east of where we sit today. Healthy Communities Coalition along with a lot of our other coalitions not only provide vital services to our communities, but many of us also serve as an umbrella for smaller nonprofits. Given the current federal instability and delay in reimbursements, we cannot guarantee this continued level of support. I ditto everything that has been said about the challenges and we have all felt it significantly. I would also like to share that the delay in contracts and reimbursements means delay in these vital services to our community members. But also, it creates the real risk of returning these valuable, unspent funds due to these delays.

Chair Considine:
Seeing no one else here in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral, is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 442? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line on A.B. 442? [There was no one.] If the presenters would like to make your final remarks, go ahead.

Assemblymember Watts:
I appreciate your time and consideration today. I think you heard in the testimony the passion that comes through. That is directly aligned with the surveys and other work that has been done that shows that this is a top priority for the nonprofit community. I will say also it is true, I did thru-hike the Tahoe Rim Trail in 2019.

One other thing I want to say is, I just really want to thank our state agencies and our state employees. I know they are working diligently. They want these grants to work. They want these services to be provided. They want to have these partnerships. While you have heard some frustrations, I just want to say that in part, that is because we are trying to modernize aging systems, and state agencies are committed to doing that. They have been excellent partners providing feedback to us on this bill and we will continue to work with them to reach a solid policy that allows both the state and nonprofit providers to better meet the needs of our community.

Chair Considine:
I will now close the hearing on A.B. 442 and we will take a five-minute recess.

[The Committee recessed at 9:14 a.m. and reconvened at 9:26 a.m.]

Chair Considine:
I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 180, which revises provisions relating to local governments. To present this measure, we have Assemblymember D'Silva. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 180: Revises provisions relating to local governments. (BDR 20-649)

Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28:
I am here today to present Assembly Bill 180, a bill that revises provisions relating to local governments. My copresenters today are with me in person: Ms. Kelli Kelly, who serves as the Nevada Food Systems advocate for the Nevada Small Business Development Center, and virtually from Las Vegas, Tony Ramirez and Noé Orosco with Make the Road Nevada. Before we begin, I want to pass it over to my copresenters in southern Nevada to explain the amendment.

Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:
I want to talk about some of the amendments before we go ahead and get started because the bill that you currently have before you, it is going to have a couple of changes [Exhibit H]. I just wanted to see if we could do that beforehand. Early on, we were able to have some conversations with a couple of stakeholders and we did receive some feedback from them. We have reflected some of that feedback in the amendments. First and foremost, we do have Washoe County being removed. Essentially the population, rather than going from 100,000 or more, it is going to 700,000. We are doing that because Reno, as part of their local regulations, has already made the decision to incorporate merchandise into their street vendors.

Specifically, sections 2, 3, 14, 13, and 22; currently, they classify personal information related to business licenses as confidential and are not subject to public records. In the conversations we had, no other industries would have been afforded the same. We are removing those provisions to ensure no single sector is disproportionately affected.

Regarding the distance requirements to the parks, the original bill prevented cities and counties from imposing any restrictions on sidewalk vendors that would be selling in or adjacent to parks. However, to address some of these concerns we are removing these provisions, which would revert back to the cities and the counties, allowing them to be able to regulate that through their regulation process just as they currently are doing with the provisions of Senate Bill 92 of the 82nd Session.

The amendments also include two additional types of inherently mobile businesses. That would be the individuals who hold a cottage food license as well as farmers that hold a producer certificate with the Nevada Department of Agriculture. For those two specific things we are adding, our copresenter Ms. Kelli Kelly is going to be able to more eloquently expand on these two industries.

The modification of the goods and merchandise is intended to ensure we encompass the range of nonfood items that our members sell. Some of the stakeholders have referenced counterfeit merchandise and we provided them with a comprehensive list of all of the items that our members sell. We had asked them to provide input on whether any of those specific merchandise items raised concerns. We have not received any feedback in terms of any specific items they wanted to further have conversations or dialogue about. We are pretty much moving forward with that just because there was nothing provided back to Mr. Ramirez and myself.

The very last thing is, the bill is defining "mobile unit" to incorporate the food trucks and other mobile food vendors, which often serve a variety of foods and beverages to the customers on the go. We want to make sure within the mobile unit, we did not inadvertently leave out food trucks. That is essentially the amendment right now. I would be happy to turn that back over to Assemblymember D'Silva.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
Thank you, Mr. Orosco, for that explanation of the amendment. As you can see, it is addressing several different issues and it is there, I believe, in the exhibit list in front of you all today, Committee members.

I will begin with explaining the background on this bill [Exhibit I]. All southern Nevada jurisdictions have their own process for mobile food vendors or food trucks. However, they are all similar in their licensing processes. Using the City of Las Vegas' general information, you can see the steps summarized for becoming licensed. The vehicle must be approved by the City of Las Vegas Fire Prevention Division; there must be a commissary agreement set up; there must be health permitting done, insurance certificate identifying the City of Las Vegas as an additional insured needs to be expressed; photos of the vehicle/trailer need to be provided; and you must have a Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles registration and a Nevada driver's license.

The cost associated with licensing includes a $50 initial processing fee, initial gross licensing fee of $100, and a semiannual gross revenue fee. An issue food trucks have in my district and in many of yours is that this process must be repeated in every jurisdiction if a mobile food business wants to operate in a different jurisdiction. This, I am told, is a major deterrent to business growth. A chef who could not be here today is a food truck owner who initially operated in Las Vegas but encountered significant challenges in securing a location for his business. He ultimately found a location in Henderson, but the transition was not seamless. Relocating meant he had to navigate the entire licensing and permitting process from scratch. This unnecessary setback took several weeks to complete, causing unexpected delays in launching his operations and slowing the overall growth of his business.

Currently, multijurisdictional licensing in southern Nevada is only allowed for contractors. This allows contractors to operate across multiple municipalities without needing to obtain separate licenses for each jurisdiction. As part of the application process, contractors are required to check the appropriate box indicating the specific municipality they intend to work in.

The goal of the bill is to create multijurisdictional business licensing for four business models: food trucks, mobile food units; sidewalk vendors; cottage food license holders; and those who hold a producer certificate from the Nevada Department of Agriculture. One of the key components of the bill is to address the unique challenges faced by these business types. Food truck operators and sidewalk vendors, for example, frequently move between different municipalities. Similarly, cottage food license holders who produce homemade goods such as baked items, jams, and confections would benefit from a more streamlined process, enabling them to sell their products in various locations without unnecessary obstacles. Additionally, farmers would gain greater flexibility to sell their goods at multiple farmers markets. Lastly, the bill adds merchandise to the definition of sidewalk vendors. As the Committee may know, only food vendors are currently included in this definition.

Currently, there are 244 mobile units registered in Nevada. This bill would provide critical support to these businesses, helping them expand and operate more efficiently. A challenge under the current system is food truck owners cannot freely choose a commissary outside the jurisdiction in which they are licensed to operate. This is also harmful to the commissary, which provides essential services such as food storage, preparation space, and sanitation facilities.

During the interim, I had the opportunity to tour Trujillo Commissary, a facility that currently serves approximately 20 food trucks. This is a commissary in my district in the Nellis Air Force Base and Lake Mead area.

Through discussions with the owners and operators, it became clear that one of the biggest challenges they face in restrictions on serving from food trucks that operate outside of Las Vegas, despite all jurisdictions being under Southern Nevada Health District having the infrastructure and resource to accommodate more clients, their growth is hindered by jurisdictional licensing constraints that prevent them from working with food truck operators in neighboring cities or Clark County.

By implementing a multijurisdictional licensing system, this bill would allow food truck owners to choose the commissary that best fits their needs, regardless of municipal boundaries. In turn, this would also support commissaries, enabling them to expand their services, increase revenue, and operate in a more streamlined manner.

As of now, there are approximately a dozen vendors who have gone through the licensing process and these are the ones who would be eligible under the provisions of this bill. Currently, a vendor cannot be licensed without first meeting the requirements of the Southern Nevada Health District. These are vendors who are subjected to inspections like other

permitted food businesses. A significant challenge facing sidewalk vendors in southern Nevada is the restrictive policies imposed by local jurisdictions, particularly regarding vending in parks and other public spaces. These limitations have acted as a deterrent, discouraging many aspiring vendors from even attempting to go through the licensing process. Allowing more freedom among southern Nevada would continue to contribute to their business growth to ensure they remain licensed.

The addition to A.B. 180 will include cottage food license holders. These are small business owners who produce homemade food products at home or small kitchens, which are made fresh and in small batches to sell online or in farmers markets. They are limited to the farmers markets in the jurisdiction where they are licensed. If they wish to participate in a market in another city, they must go through an entirely new licensing process for desired jurisdiction. By incorporating cottage food license holders into A.B. 180, the bill allows the small business owners to sell their products more freely across southern Nevada.

The addition to A.B. 180 will also include a producer's certificate holder, which is issued by the Nevada Department of Agriculture. These certificate holders are farmers, agricultural producers who cultivate and sell fresh, locally grown products such as fruits, vegetables, herbs, honey, and other farm goods. Currently, there are 136 producer's certificate holders in Clark County, many of whom rely on selling their products at farmers markets and direct-to-consumer venues. By streamlining the regulatory process, the bill would enable these farmers and agricultural producers to reach a wider customer base and strengthen Nevada's local food system. This change would not only benefit farmers but also enhance consumer access to fresh, locally sourced food.

Assembly Bill 180 will expand the definition of a "sidewalk vendor" to include the sale of merchandise [Exhibit I]. In addition to food, S.B. 92 of the 82nd Session only includes food vendors. By broadening this definition, the bill would allow vendors to legally sell nonfood items such as clothing, accessories, artwork, handcrafted goods, and other retail merchandise.

Here you see Maria Munoz with her cart, showing her product, which is wholesale or homemade items—none of which is counterfeit by the way, along with five vendors who are interested in going through the licensing process and the types of products they sell. Here you can see the clientele, essentially, that this bill is looking to support and the sort of merchandise they are looking to now sell.

In closing, A.B. 180 aims to modernize and streamline business licensing in southern Nevada, making it easier for mobile food vendors, sidewalk vendors, cottage food producers, and agricultural businesses to operate across multiple jurisdictions. By implementing a multijurisdictional licensing system, the bill would eliminate redundant application processes and support small business growth. This change would allow food trucks to freely choose commissaries, enable cottage food producers and farmers to sell in multiple markets without unnecessary restrictions. These reforms are crucial for strengthening Nevada's small business ecosystem, increasing economic opportunity, and ensuring that vendors remain compliant with health and safety regulations. Assembly Bill 180 will empower local

entrepreneurs, support economic development, and enhance consumer access to fresh, local, and handmade products. With that, Committee, we stand ready to answer any questions you may have.

[Exhibit J was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Considine:
Thank you for the presentation. We will go to questions and we will begin with Assemblymember Jackson.

Assemblymember Jackson:
I am concerned with the merch part of the bill and how it is regulated because merchandise can be many items. I could simply hand you something that could be considered merchandise. My fear is that it may become criminalized. What would be the final penalty for those who do not have the merchant license?

Assemblymember D'Silva:
Thank you, Assemblymember Jackson, for that important question. I know it has come up a lot during the negotiations along this bill. Can I kick that down to Mr. Ramirez in Las Vegas for a more clarifying answer?

Antonio Ramirez, Government Affairs Director, Make the Road Nevada:
Currently the folks you saw in the presentation do not have a process for themselves. I believe the penalty for doing business without a business license comes with a fine and potential jail time of up to six months. That is the process we want to avoid that currently exists for merchandise vendors. Maria Munoz, who you saw in the presentation, received a fine of $310 and she makes approximately $400 a month. We want to legitimize her business so she avoids some of those interactions you are concerned about.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
To build on that, when we had meetings with the community along the lines of this conversation about street vending and merchandise in particular, we were able to notice most of these entrepreneurs wanted to become legitimate; they wanted some kind of a process where now they had a legitimate process to which they could get a license. We also saw the incomes they were making were relatively low. They were averaging about $400 a month. You cannot live off of $400 a month. What we know is these businesses are side businesses that help augment income into the household. If you are fined for $310, that is pretty much 85 percent of what you have made in that one month. This is, again, one of the crucialities we took into consideration when we brought about this legislation to address that specific need. That is a very good question, Assemblymember Jackson. Thank you for the question.

Assemblymember Gallant:
I do have a question in terms of—contractors right now are able to get a multijurisdictional license. They are the only ones, but we have plenty of fields, particularly in Clark County, where we have Henderson, North Las Vegas, Las Vegas, and Clark County. All of these

municipalities have their own business licenses and it is kind of onerous on a lot of different industries. I am curious why you chose just for the food vendors instead of maybe just looking at it holistically and trying to ensure that the municipalities do this for all industry. In my head, I imagine, are we going to do a bill for each individual licensing? That statute in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) is just going to be miles and miles long. I am curious why you chose to do it this way instead of a broad sweeping so we could offer the same multijurisdictional licensing to everyone?

Assemblymember D'Silva:
That is an excellent question. I have said this in front of this Committee many times before. The bills that I take on are brought to me by my constituents. I have a lot of town halls and meet with them almost on a daily basis when it comes to the ideation portion. This is something that was brought to me. I have many food truck vendors and street vendors who live in my district who said, We just want to become legitimate. When it comes to mobile businesses in general, that was the industry that came to me and had this conversation; it was the food truck industry. Make the Road Nevada has been doing a lot of work on this for years now.

I do agree with you. I think any business that is inherently mobile, we should look at working on NRS to allow them to be mobile and to actually have red tape removed. We approached this in a piecemeal sort of way and identified food trucks as being a business that is, bottom line, it is a truck, it moves around. These jurisdictions are very close to one another. My district, I have North Las Vegas, I have Las Vegas, and I have unincorporated Clark County. That has compartmentalized my district. It is very easy to jump from one district jurisdiction to another and then all of a sudden be in violation of the law or have a licensing issue. That is the industry that came to me. I do agree with you. I think we should look at opening this up to other industries and other businesses as well. I do not know if Mr. Ramirez or Mr. Orosco had anything to add to this statement?

Antonio Ramirez:
We looked at sidewalk vendors specifically because their costs are extremely high. A startup, as you saw in the presentation, is $2,000 potentially—just a startup—and then a card is expensive as well. Our concern was how long will they be able to stay licensed if they are not able to freely move around in a way that grows their income. That is why we looked at them. Food trucks, as well, are dealing with a lot of issues. I will let my copresenter from Ibarra's Food Truck here add to that if there are questions around that. They are also dealing with a lot of issues that are impacting their income as well.

Assemblymember Flanagan:
Aspects of it I get, and I guess in some ways I like, for producers with the certificate holders for the Department of Agriculture because of the ability it would give them to go to different farmers markets, from what I understood in the presentation, and to be able to do their business; even with the cottage food license holders, also sounds like people who are at home

with a small business, then trying to go out in different spaces, sell their wares. If they have the multijurisdictional licensing, it would make it easier to do it. I even get the self-contained food trucks.

What I am wondering is, how this works across the counties and the cities; specifically, the sidewalk vendors, and the zoning, the setup, the location, the spacing? Because it is very different when you come to a sidewalk vendor. They are almost an island unto themselves because they feel very different from the other categories you have listed in the legislation. Can you talk about how you see the cities actually achieving this and the zone?

Kelli Kelly, Advisor, Nevada Food Systems, Nevada Small Business Development Center:
First, I appreciate you identifying and talking about cottage food license holders and Nevada agricultural producers. I would just like to get on the record that at any given time during the season in Las Vegas and Clark County, there are between 20 to 25 farmers markets that operate in virtually every municipality. Cottage food license holders are currently required by statute to sell their products direct to consumer, in-person sales, and are limited to $35,000 in gross sales. For a cottage food vendor who is interested in selling at farmers markets, that is one of the main places they sell. In order to go to those different locations, they end up in a licensure rabbit hole. I just wanted to thank you for that question or that observation and get that on the record before turning it over to Assemblymember D'Silva to talk about sidewalk vendors.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
I would like for Mr. Ramirez to extrapolate on this question. It is a very good one. The main issue we are dealing with when it came to the sidewalk vendors—not knowing the boundaries of these jurisdictions, I get lost because you have these sidesteps, you have the staircasing—the real issue was, can we just get one license that will allow you to operate in Clark County, the whole county, so you are not worried about the red tape of having to, first and foremost, know these different boundaries. Secondly, if you want to operate in multiple jurisdictions you have to go through this process over and over and over again; keep up with the local mandates, the local laws, the ever-changing landscape of the regulatory process. Having a one-stop shop is the most important aspect I believe of this legislation. We are also talking about individuals, immigrant communities, who are already having a tremendous challenge navigating this new terrain, this new land, this new country, this new language. They are trying to make a living.

One of the key ways we saw of addressing issues they are faced with, but also anybody in general who has a mobile business, is this issue of having to work with different jurisdictions when it comes to licensing. Having a one-stop shop would actually mitigate a great deal of those worries and those issues and would actually create a more streamlined business environment for businesses, especially businesses that are mobile, such as the street vendors and our food trucks. Mr. Orosco, would you like to explain a little bit more in detail about the specific issues of street vendors via the sidewalk licensing?

Noé Orosco:
Assemblymember Flanagan, it is an excellent question that you bring up specifically in regards to the sidewalk vendors. Senate Bill 92 of the 82nd Session is what ended up setting up that framework. In terms of the cities and the counties, they already should have that process for how sidewalk vendors would be able to operate. All that A.B. 180 is trying to do is incorporate the merchant vendors. Whatever that process is already, it would just expand it from food vendors to merchandise vendors. To Assemblymember D'Silva's point, it is really just trying to ensure there is one place these individuals who are trying to operate in multiple municipalities, they would be able to go to one place to be able to fill out the application, then be able to operate in any of those jurisdictions they would like.

Assemblymember Flanagan:
To make sure I am clear, based on Mr. Orosco's testimony, I understand that sidewalk vendors exist at this time; but per this legislation, this is to give them as well as the other three categories multijurisdictional operation rights. Correct? Am I not understanding that?

Assemblymember D'Silva:
That is correct, Assemblymember.

Assemblymember Flanagan:
Then my question still stands to make sure I understand how the different entities would organize sidewalk vendors. It would still have to be set up to figure out how that really works so there is [audio was lost] because what the county does is not necessarily what a city does with a sidewalk vendor. What one allows is not what the other one allows. They still have to get together. Believe me, those permitting processes are exhaustive because I have shepherded some before. They still have to get together and figure out who is allowing what; where you can be; what the hours are; if the fees line up, are the fees different from one to the next; how they disperse the fees across the different jurisdictions; does the county take so much, does the city take so much. I just want to make sure I am clear that this would still be to include them in a multijurisdictional consideration.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
In order to take the first crack at it—because you can hear multiple perspectives on this very question; you hear from the locals, you hear from the business community. I want to allow Tony Ramirez to give the perspective of Make the Road Nevada, specifically on that question of yours. Mr. Ramirez?

Antonio Ramirez:
To clarify, currently merchandise vendors are not included in the sale, the way that they operate. There are folks who can operate door-to-door sales, et cetera. But the way the folks we represent operate, that process does not exist. The intention is to have everyone together and create a system similar to contractors if that is what they see works best. We are not putting any restrictions on how they would approach that process. We just want that process to exist for these four entities as well.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
One of my own perspectives, a vision really, where we can create a new policy that is going to be created through the partnership of the local jurisdictions coming together and creating some kind of a regulatory process that is going to be uniform across the board. The main impetus, the main goal here is to create a multijurisdictional license that is going to allow free flow between the jurisdictions. Inherently a part of that will be the creation of new policies and regulations that will help with that process. It is my hope that that does happen.

Assemblymember Jackson:
My question is pertaining to merchandise licensing and outreach. Would this bill impact those collecting donations for nonprofit purposes?

Assemblymember D'Silva:
As the bill is written, there is no language there pertaining to donations or nonprofits. This is strictly looking at folks who are working in an entrepreneurial setting who are looking to start a business. We are looking at businesses that are operating along the perimeters of Senate Bill 92 of the 82nd Session, sidewalk sort of economic understanding, that sort of culture; also, inherently mobile businesses that are moving about between different jurisdictions. As written, I personally do not see—we probably want to get some more eyes on that. If you are collecting donations or anything, that is outside of the actual scope and the parameters of this particular bill.

Chair Considine:
Seeing no other questions from the Committee, we will move on to testimony. I would like to begin in Carson City with testimony in support of A.B. 180. Please come to the table and begin when you are ready.

Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation:
We are here today to speak in favor of the amendment, specifically dealing with cottage license holders and also producer certificate holders that have those certificates from the Department of Agriculture. That amendment is something that we are very favorable for and would encourage you to incorporate into the bill as it goes forward.

Chair Considine:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 180? [There was no one.] We will move to Las Vegas. We already have some people at the table. Please begin when you are ready for testimony in support of A.B. 180.

Ronald Najarro, State Director, Americans For Prosperity Nevada:
[Read from Exhibit K.] On behalf of my organization, I thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of A.B. 180, a bill that will provide substantial regulatory relief for entrepreneurs in our state by mandating that large counties and municipalities create a seamless licensing regime that will allow vendors to sell in various locations without having to apply for and pay for multiple licenses. It will help access more economic opportunity while also ensuring that compliance with licensing is easily achieved. Americans

for Prosperity Nevada believes now is the time for our elected officials to come together and address these challenges with sound solutions like what A.B. 180 licensing reform achieves, so that we can together build a Nevada that empowers every individual to reach their full potential.

With less burdensome regulations, both entrepreneurs running businesses and workers trying to earn a living for their families will be able to chase opportunity instead of permission. Assembly Bill 180 creates a one-stop process to secure licensing in their pursuit to earn income as a sidewalk or mobile vendor across the state. Americans for Prosperity Nevada applauds the bill sponsor, Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, for bringing this bill forward. We urge you to please support A.B. 180, a transformative first step that will no doubt help entrepreneurs in the pursuit of their American dream secure more robust license with more economic opportunities that will improve the lives of families in our communities.

Eddie Diaz, Strategic Director, The LIBRE Initiative Nevada:
[Read from Exhibit L.] The LIBRE Initiative Nevada is one of the largest Latino organizations dedicated to empowering the Hispanic community in Nevada and across the nation. On behalf of The LIBRE Initiative, I am here to express my strong support for A.B. 180, a much-needed piece of legislation that has the power to remove unnecessary barriers for hardworking Nevadans, especially those in the Latino community who are pursuing their dream through small business ownership.

Latinos represent a growing share of small business owners in Nevada, many of whom operate as mobile food vendors, street vendors, or independent contractors. For many Latinos, street vending is more than a job. It is a first step toward economic independence and upward mobility. However, the current patchwork of local regulations and licensing requirements can make it extremely difficult and expensive for these entrepreneurs to legally operate across different cities or counties. This creates confusion, delays, and financial burdens for people who are simply trying to provide for their families and contribute to their communities. Assembly Bill 180 will streamline the licensing process, helping reduce red tape and costs for small-scale vendors, many of whom are immigrants or first-generation business owners. This bill lowers the barrier to entry for those who may not have traditional access to capital or resources, giving them a fair shot to grow and succeed.

This legislation sends a clear message that Nevada values and supports those who hustle, innovate, and serve their communities. It helps people rise up the economic ladder by allowing them to formalize and grow their businesses without being penalized by outdated or inconsistent regulations. In short, this bill will empower entrepreneurs and reinforce Nevada's reputation as a place where small businesses can thrive. I respectfully urge this Committee to vote in favor of A.B. 180.

Cristina Arroyo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
[Testimony given in Spanish, translated by Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez.] [Read from Exhibit M.] We are Cristina Arroyo and Sergio Galvan, proud members of Make the Road Nevada and owners of Taqueria El Pastorcito.

Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez, Translator, Deputy Organizing Director, Make The Road Nevada:
I will be serving as a translator for our members. I will be translating our members' remarks here.

Cristina Arroyo:
Recently, we remodeled our food trucks to improve our service and meet all requirements. However, even though we are in full compliance, we are forced to redo all the paperwork from scratch. This process caused us to lose almost a month of work due to excessive paperwork and the fact that everything is done by appointment only. That loss cost us approximately $8,000 to $10,000 in revenue.

We have always followed the rules, but the paperwork and complicated processes continue to be an obstacle that slows down our growth. That is why we support A.B. 180. This bill would allow us to expand our business into different areas of the city without having to repeat the same steps over and over again. It would open up new opportunities and allow us to hire more workers in our community. Assembly Bill 180 does not just support small business owners, but it also helps strengthen the local economy and create jobs. We urge our representatives to pass this bill and listen to those of us who fight every day to get ahead.

Samantha Silcox, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am representing Ibarra's Food Truck Builders, Ibarra's Rent-A-Food Truck, Ibarra's Commissary, and Street Tacos, which is a mobile food trailer located on Fremont Street. This is specifically regarding the multijurisdictional business license for mobile food vendors, mobile food trailers, and mobile food trucks. As Assemblymember D'Silva mentioned earlier, the licensing process for the City of Las Vegas requires certain steps. However, across multiple jurisdictions in Clark County, the application process is different. For example, City of Las Vegas does not require a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department background check whereas unincorporated Clark County and North Las Vegas does.

In addition to those background checks, the vendors will then need to pay $1,645, which includes the limited liability company all the way down to that jurisdictional license, in addition to multiple jurisdictional license applications and business licenses. The limitation of commissaries in southern Nevada forces vendors to choose commissaries that are available; whereas if a mobile food vendor intends operating only in the City of Las Vegas, and the City of Las Vegas does not have any more available commissaries, the street vendor must go and apply for a commissary in North Las Vegas, apply and obtain a North Las Vegas business license even though they do not intend on operating in that area or jurisdiction.

This inhibits vendors from being able to apply for and attend events and festivals that are outside of that jurisdiction, as application time will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In Clark County and southern Nevada there is City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, City of North Las Vegas, and unincorporated Clark County. If a vendor wishes to operate in

an event that is outside of the jurisdiction, they will then need to take that time and apply for a new license for that area where the event is going to be held, thus hindering or even stopping them from being able to work at that event. I am testifying in support of A.B. 180.

Mariana Miranda, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
[Testimony given in Spanish and translated by Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez.] [Read from Exhibit N.] I am a proud member of Make the Road Nevada. I am here to express my support for Assembly Bill 180. I have been a street vendor for two years, offering flowers, T-shirts, hats, rings, bracelets, stuffed animals, balloons, and chocolates. This work allows me to support my family and be an active part of my community. I have tried to get a permit, but it has been very complicated. The process is confusing, expensive, and there is not enough information available in Spanish. The language barrier means that many of us do not even know where to start. We get sent from one office to another, and in the end, we make no progress.

All of this causes a lot of stress. Many times I am afraid to go out and sell, worried that someone will fine me or take my products. I know other vendors who have received fines up to $500, and that is more than what we make in several days of work. I just want to work peacefully, without hiding, and be able to offer my products with dignity. Assembly Bill 180 would give me that chance. Having a clear and accessible permit would allow me to focus on my work, grow my business, and take care of my family without fear. I ask you to support A.B. 180. It is a way to give us respect, stability, and peace.

Cecilia Mendez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a member and leader of Make the Road Nevada [Read from Exhibit O]. I am in support of A.B. 180. I have lived in this country for 33 years and I have worked as a street vendor for over 38 years. I have been selling for all occasion; graduation, Mother's Day, Valentine's, gift baskets, and flower bouquets for all occasion. This is work that I love because I can connect with my community. But each city requires a different license with different rules, forms in English, and repeat costs. All this makes us lose time, money, and support. Sometimes the fear is being fined or removed, stopping for me working. I do not have reserves to pay fines. I hope support of A.B. 180 will [unintelligible] allowed to work with single license across multiple cities with rules that are clear and fair. I ask the Assembly to support A.B. 180 so those of us who have worked with dignity for years can keep moving forward without fear. Thank you so much and have a blessed day.

LeRoy Peters, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada:
I have been in other countries of the world and ate off the street many times from vendors. For this to be such a hassle for these people is ludicrous. Assembly Bill 180 will allow them a way of sharing their culture with us as they could make meals and sell them, as we could buy them off the street from them that we cannot get from a restaurant. It was pointed out one time, two years ago, that the problem was health wise. Let me tell you, if somebody fixes a meal and sells it on the street to me, they do not want to make me sick. They want to make me come back and want to make me share my experience with them and with other people so

they can get more business. Assembly Bill 180 will help them and help a citizen like me that is stupid enough, as you would say, to buy off the street from people that is making a good meal that I can buy. Thank you for your concern.

Chair Considine:
We have used more than 15 minutes of the 20 minutes allocated for support. I would like to go to the phone lines. If we can come back after the phone lines to Las Vegas, I would request that if anyone still wants to testify in support that they state their name and ditto so that we can get as many people on the record as possible. Can we go to the phone lines for support of A.B. 180?

Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:
I would like to ditto all of the support testimony thus far and emphasize how supportive we are of this bill.

Chandler Cooks, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am in support of A.B. 180. As a business adviser for the Urban Chamber of Commerce, I have worked with hundreds of food operators from sidewalk vendors to food truck operators. I have seen how Nevada is the home to a rising generation of entrepreneurs. They are not asking for shortcuts. They are asking for a chance to grow their business without hitting a wall every time they cross that jurisdictional line. Right now a food truck operator in Clark County may be required to pay duplicative licensing fees, navigate multiple applications, and then follow different rules in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and any other unincorporated areas just to operate a few blocks away. For many small business owners, that is not just inefficient, it is inhibitive.

According to a 2022 report by the Institute for Justice, nearly 60 percent of mobile vendors across the U.S. cite license complexity and inconsistent regulations as their top barrier to growth. The 2021 Brookings Institution study shows that simplifying local licensing processes can increase microbusiness formation by 17 percent, especially in low-income communities. This bill creates a smart, coordinated system that allows vendors and contractors to claim one license to operate across multiple jurisdictions provided they meet all the state and local requirements. That is not deregulation, that is regulatory efficiency. When we create a legal structure that makes room for these businesses to thrive, we are not just boosting the economy, we are investing in community resilience. This removes the unnecessary duplication and the outdated silos that stifle entrepreneurship. I urge your support for A.B. 180.

Chair Considine:
We have a few minutes left. We will go back to Las Vegas. We will get through as many testifiers in support as possible. Please consider if your statements have been made to say ditto. As a reminder, we accept all public testimony up to 24 hours after the hearing. Please go ahead in Las Vegas.

Faridy Canales, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
[Read from Exhibit P.] I am a proud member [unintelligible] of Make the Road Nevada. I am here to support bill A.B. 180.

Marina Cerrano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
[Testimony given in Spanish, translated by Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez.] [Read from Exhibit Q.] I support A.B. 180.

Gaudencia Torrez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
[Testimony given in Spanish, translated by Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez.] [Read from Exhibit R.] I am here in support of A.B. 180.

Isabel Pastrana, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I support A.B. 180.

Elizabeth Ortiz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a proud member leader of Make the Road Nevada. I am here to support A.B. 180.

[Exhibit S and Exhibit T were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Considine:
If I could just potentially ask if everyone who is in support with Make the Road Nevada to please stand up and we can get a count of how many folks are in support in Las Vegas. That is about the whole room. We will notate that and thank you so much for giving this testimony. Is there anyone in support of A.B. 180 in Las Vegas that is not part of Make the Road Nevada? If that person can come up, this will be the last testimony we take in support. Just to be clear, everyone in Las Vegas has either testified or are in support of A.B. 180 and they are with Make the Road Nevada.

Hernan Alvarez-Sanchez:
Yes.

Chair Considine:
Thank you so much for coming in. Thank you for providing testimony, and please remember you can send in testimony up to 24 hours after the hearing. We will now move on to opposition to Assembly Bill 180. We will begin in Carson City.

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:
I first want to thank Assemblymember D'Silva for being so gracious with his time and hearing our concerns on this legislation. He has been very great to work with. His door is always open for us to come in and discuss this bill. The City is opposed to A.B. 180 as drafted and amended by the conceptual amendment; in particular, sections 2, 3, 13, and 14, which are in regard to the multijurisdictional licensing and create a mandate for certain

businesses to be made into multijurisdictional licenses. I can tell you that we are well on our way towards making multijurisdictional sidewalk vendor licenses a reality, and the sidewalk vendor program should be in place before the end of the legislative session.

This is something we started last fall. The cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, as well as Clark County, we all committed to the Task Force on Safe Sidewalk Vending that was created from S.B. 92 of the 82nd Session. We all worked together on our ordinances and we all committed to that task force that was run by the Office of the Secretary of State. We all committed that multijurisdictional licensing would happen for the sidewalk vendor program.

As far as numbers are concerned, you heard about us having contractors as a multijurisdictional license type. We do, and that is well over 5,000 contractors are multijurisdictional. Currently, on the sidewalk vendor front we have less than ten across the entire Las Vegas Valley. All four jurisdictions are committed. We are moving forward with this program.

As far as the food trucks, which were also brought up, we have all finally come to an agreement, the four entities in southern Nevada, on how to move forward on food trucks. The issue with mobile food vendors is, we all have some legacy ordinances in place that require background checks. It is a background check process. It is a privileged license with our organization in Henderson. Las Vegas has, in the last 24 months, moved forward and taken the privileged license piece away. All four entities in southern Nevada have committed to doing that. What we are going to do is split our license type between mobile food vendors and not require a background check anymore. Those are food trucks that sell burgers, tacos, or pizza. Those are for adults.

We are all going to create a novelty food vendor category that is directed to children. That is what most of our mobile food vendor ordinances were originally created to handle. Over many years, it had become the mobile food vendor, food truck industry that you see today.

Chair Considine:
I just had a question. We had something that was sent in as an attachment. I thought there was one slide you wanted to present and I know we wanted to wrap up.

Mike Cathcart:
I do not need to present the slide. I can talk about the attachment [Exhibit U] we put as an exhibit on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

Chair Considine:
We are in the 20-minute time limit for opposition. If you do that really quick.

Mike Cathcart:
In the last 18 months, the local governments, which we have always worked together on multijurisdictional licensing, we have a very solid plan on where we are going to be going over the next two years as far as multijurisdictional licensing is concerned. The great thing over the last 18 months is, the Secretary of State's Office has hired a consulting group called Gartner. They have been out meeting with all of the local governments. There are Secretary of State management folks on our committee as well. We as a statewide business licensing group for the first time, and I have been in this area for almost 15 years, this is the best cooperation we have ever had across the state on how to move us forward as a state and be the national leader on ease of getting a license so that we can attract business here from the state level down to the county and city levels. That is our goal.

That is what we are working towards in the document that I put up on NELIS [Exhibit U]. It shows the progress we are making on that, and we do not want to be diverted from that commitment. The multijurisdictional licensing types are in that document. We have committed to the statewide group that we will continue doing those things moving forward and adding more industries to the multijurisdictional. We want to keep on the path that we are on and not be diverted by A.B. 180.

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:
I want to concur with the comments of my colleague, Mike Cathcart from the City of Henderson, on the multijurisdictional license piece. I will say our business license departments have, every successive session, had to have these mandates put upon them. It takes away from the work they are doing every time we need to go back and stop that work and try and work in new legislation that comes, respectfully.

Following up, our issues very specifically are on enforcement under the terms of the bill and the amendment. There is no definition of merchandise. Assemblymember Jackson, you brought this up. There is no definition and merchandise was specifically excluded from the bill last session after significant negotiations because of concerns about counterfeit merchandise around sports paraphernalia and other items. Our current ordinance excludes such items. Our sidewalk vending ordinance excludes such items, which could be merchandise, including weapons, drug paraphernalia, other types of things, adult-oriented material. There are no exclusions to the definition here. I know there were pictures put up about the types of merchandise that the vendors would like to sell, but that is not in the bill.

I want to also talk about our existing ordinance. The existing ordinance in Clark County excludes commercial areas. I want the people in Las Vegas to specifically understand if you are being added to our ordinance, you are prohibited from sales in commercial areas—it will be in the residential areas—and also prohibited from selling adjacent to a corner, to a highway. There will be hours of operation that they will have to comply with. This is one of the things with the amendment that says that merchandise is excluded for counterfeit. That puts our business license department in the role of trying to enforce what is counterfeit or what is not counterfeit in our community. The reason why it is a business license is because

largely, our ordinance is restricted; the sales where you can do are in the residential areas. I know this is population capped. As the largest jurisdiction in the state, there is a vast difference between the City of Reno and Clark County. For that reason, I am opposed to this bill.

Yoana Ontiveros, representing Henderson Chamber of Commerce:
The Henderson Chamber of Commerce has over 2,000 members and the majority are small businesses who express their opposition to A.B. 180. Assembly Bill 180 will create an unfair advantage for specific groups of licensees, subjecting them to less stringent requirements than other businesses. The business license process should be fair and equal to all applicants. However, A.B. 180 will allow the government to selectively grant privileges, effectively picking winners and losers in the marketplace. In addition, residential neighborhoods are carefully zoned to maintain safety and quality of life. Yet this bill would permit sidewalk vendors to operate in spaces not designed for commercial activity, creating potential hazards.

Finally, traditional brick-and-mortar businesses, which provide stable employment and generate essential tax revenue, will face significant disadvantage under this bill through an unfair licensing process and potential negative effects to the bottom line. While the business community strongly supports entrepreneurship and small businesses, this bill introduces unfair, inconsistent licensing, and will benefit one group at the expense of others, creating imbalance in the regulatory system. For those reasons, we oppose.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:
The Chamber is opposed to A.B. 180 and the proposed amendment. We are concerned about the broad definition, as you have heard from Clark County, about the merchandise. Typically, that extends the type of list you would see in a retail operation such as a gift shop, a pharmacy, or souvenir store that do require significant cost to get up and running. We are concerned about that as well.

Regarding S.B. 92 of the 82nd Session that was adopted, in those compromise conversations with stakeholders, merchandise was specifically taken out to some of those points. You have heard about those concerns with what those entail. That was part of the compromise. That bill also specifically called for a task force, the Task Force on Safe Sidewalk Vending; I served on behalf of the business community. The cottage food conversation and the merchandise conversation were not part of those conversations, nor were they part of the formal recommendations from that task force. And I question the purpose of the task force and why we spent over a year and a half having those conversations not to follow those recommendations for consideration from the body, but rather to bring this bill forward.

As from the Chamber's perspective, the equity and parity to our existing businesses has to be taken into consideration. We know you do because many of those reside in your districts and they are job creators, they are employers, they are workers in those stores in your districts. We believe this bill creates significant challenges as it relates to zoning, access to sidewalks, and enforcement. With that closing, we do recognize, and many of you know, the Chamber has advocated for years about lower licensing fees and easier regulations to streamline. We

are working with our local government partners, but we believe that this bill will create a different class of businesses and equity in the system today. Thank you very much, Madam Chair and members of the Committee.

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas:
The City of Las Vegas is in opposition to A.B. 180. The Las Vegas City Council adopted an ordinance that did not include merchandise from our sidewalk vending ordinance in an effort to protect public safety, reduce challenges with enforcement on what vendors are selling, and avoid potential issues with fraudulent or stolen goods being sold. Even if counterfeit goods are excluded, enforcement still becomes difficult when trying to determine what is legitimate and what is not.

To address some of the questions that were asked during the presentation, currently, a vendor selling jam at a farmers market does not need an individual business license to sell those homemade confections. The promoter of the farmers market would be the responsible party for pulling the license for those types of events, not the individual. To address the comments related to each jurisdiction having different restrictions of their vendor license category, the southern Nevada jurisdictions worked, after last session, to ensure that our ordinance within southern Nevada were all the same. The business license managers meet monthly in the interim and throughout the year to work on recommendations such as multijurisdictional licenses. Keeping these types of requirements out of state statute allows our licensing departments to work quickly and nimbly to align with each other through the local government ordinance process instead of waiting to make changes to state law every two years.

Joelle Gutman Dodson, Government Affairs Liaison, Northern Nevada Public Health:
I just wanted to extend my apologies to Assemblymember D'Silva because I was made aware of this amendment this morning. I wanted to get on the record that we have some real concerns with the potential impact of the amendment regarding the cottage food permits. As you are probably aware, there are two other bills being proposed that significantly change the definition of cottage food, and also for cottage food licenses, where one would get a permit after moving it from local jurisdiction to the state. With this amendment, it is really confusing with how that would work. We are worried that would negatively impact public health and food safety standards.

As mentioned earlier, I was also an appointed member of the Task Force on Safe Sidewalk Vending. I want to just reiterate that cottage food was not an agreed-upon recommendation. There was one agreed-upon recommendation and that was to have state-funded commissaries in both the north and south. I am here today asking Make the Road Nevada to engage Public Health in this conversation so we can weigh in and tell them our concerns. I also want you all to know that I realize Washoe County has population capped out of the amendment, but I am not sure how that will play out later on. I am speaking on behalf of Public Health for the entire state.

Nick Vassiliadis, representing Nevada Resort Association:
We stand firmly opposed to this bill as drafted and with the proposed amendment. A bit of history: last session, on S.B. 92 of the 82nd Session, a bunch of the people here who are opposed today actually worked as part of a stakeholder group to try and find resolution to that bill and recognize the need to balance young up-and-comers with food vendors, and also the needs of the community with the existing business structure that we have. Most of us actually, in result of that compromise, came to the table and supported that bill. It might be odd we are here opposing today. I think the thing we find most frustrating, however, is a task force was set up and almost none of those recommendations were brought forth to you.

The most frustrating to the Nevada Resort Association is that merchandise piece. Last session, the merchandise piece was a significant piece of the deal to bring us to the table and support this. We do have to protect the state's key economic driver. Sports is a big aspect of that, and selling merchandise to those sporting venues is significant. For all of those reasons and all of the reasons that you have heard before today, we are going to stand opposed to this bill and we would urge you guys to oppose this as well.

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada:
We strongly oppose A.B. 180, which seeks to revise local government regulations for sidewalk vendors. Our primary concern centers around the impact this legislation would have on the cost of doing business and fair price instructors that traditional brick-and-mortar retailers uphold. Traditional retail businesses in Nevada invest significantly in complying with regulatory requirements, licensing fees, rent, wages, taxes, health, and safety standards. These mandatory expenses directly influence the cost of our products that we provide to our consumers. These mandatory expenses directly influence that process.

Assembly Bill 180 as proposed would grant sidewalk vendors and mobile food establishments unfair economic advantages by allowing them to circumvent or minimize many of these essential operating costs. When you talk about why these costs are so up, all of the regulations, every single license, every single story you heard from today is a cost that must be recuperated into prices. We feel it is an unlevel playing field when traditional brick-and-mortar retail are having to compete with merchandise from folks who do not have to follow the same government-mandated rules that you folks are bringing.

We also think that there are some safety issues regarding merchandise; for instance, baby formula, which—for something in the language, there is nothing that would seem to prohibit the sale of—needs to be stored correctly. There are lots of different merchandise products that the safety and the storage deal with how well you are able to consume them and whether or not they are going to be harmful for you. We do not see anything in the provisions that address some of those handling and safety concerns and for that, we remain opposed to Assembly Bill 180.

Chair Considine:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 180? [There was no one.] We will go to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 180? [There was no one.] We will go to the phone lines. Is there anyone on the lines wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 180?

Berry Johnston, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
While I agree with and appreciate Americans For Prosperity and The LIBRE Initiative, their work is important, but I feel they are taking what they can get to help people because this body is terribly parasitic and businesses are desperate. The Nevada Legislature and municipalities continue its obsession with control and extraction. Assembly Bill 180 is sold as a simplification, but make no mistake. This bill is not about freedom. It is about centralized licensing, data collection, and keeping the state's boot on the neck of these hard-working Nevadans.

You are not helping sidewalk vendors, you are trapping them in a bigger government web. These people are trying to sell food, flowers, and trinkets—people who just want to feed their families. What do you do? You make them ask permission, pay outrageous fees, get licensed, and track in some government database. For what? So the state can squeeze them for a few more bucks? This is a governance? It is legalized theft and economic slavery. The founding fathers would be ashamed. Thomas Jefferson said it best. "The wise and frugal government . . . shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." You are doing the exact opposite. Instead of liberating the smallest entrepreneurs in our state, you are tying their hands with regulations and using the excuse of health and safety to justify your bureaucracy, all while the same government squanders billions; waste, corruption, and failed programs.

If you truly wanted to help these people, you would abolish all licenses, recognize the right to earn a living without permission, and get the government out of the way. The vendors and workers in Nevada do not need your protection. They need your absence. The groups today are worried about what you steal from them via government fees and taxes. Solve the problem by leaving us alone. Stop trying to engineer a society through regulation and theft. Let the people trade freely as the *Constitution* agrees. Welcome the hustle, but we also do not need to spend money on other languages. Learn English, adapt, overcome, fight to eliminate government—

Chair Considine:
Thank you, that is two minutes. Thank you for your call Mr. Johnston.

Peter Saba, Senior Government Affairs Manager, Nevada Restaurant Association:
The Association is in opposition today due to the cottage food. We want to ditto what the Northern Nevada Public Health district was saying.

Chair Considine:
We will move on to neutral testimony. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 180? [There was no one.] In Las Vegas, is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 180? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line wishing to give neutral testimony on A.B. 180? [There was no one.] Would the presenter like to make any final remarks? Go ahead when you are ready.

Assemblymember D'Silva:
I have a few brief comments, very brief, to close today. I want to thank everybody who has participated in these negotiations. I know we are all coming from a place of good faith and we are trying to work this out. I am also very much encouraged by the fact the local municipalities are working on a multijurisdictional business license framework that could potentially come out before the end of the session. But we also believe we should push this bill forward to be assured we can get something done in this regard.

I know many of you have received letters and emails. I have received a whole bunch even before this started from folks who are really petitioning me, using their First Amendment right to let us know how they felt about this issue. I went back and looked at some of those Zip Codes that these letters were coming from. I ask some of them when I meet them, Where are you from? What is your Zip Code? It helps me aggregate where these needs are coming from; 89101, 89115, 89106, 89110, 89031, 89032, 89156, 89030—where some did come out in multiple individuals from these Zip Codes. If you look at those various Zip Codes, you will also see they are some of the poorest in our state in terms of per capita income.

We talked about fees; $310 fine, $1,600 licenses fee, a couple hundred dollars for background checks for multiple jurisdictions. To some folks, this is just the mere fees of doing business. But to some individuals who are our most in need, most socioeconomically disadvantaged Zip Codes and parts of the state, this is a big deal. It is also my sense that government is here to help people and to try to allow them to get some kind of a foundation, some kind of a catapult even, especially for those who want to help themselves.

I want you to think about that as we move forward with this legislation. I know this is going to be an ongoing bill and I am looking forward to working in good faith with everybody who was in support and was in opposition to this piece of legislation. In the end, I believe that it is going to cut that red tape, make a more streamlined process available for folks who really want to make something of themselves in our communities, in our state, and our country. Thank you for that and thank you for the opportunity to present this bill today to the Committee.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Chair Considine:
I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 180. We will now move to public comment. Is there any public comment here in Carson City? [There was none.] Seeing no one in Las Vegas, we will move to the phone lines. Is there anyone online for public comment today? [There was no one.]

The next meeting will be Monday, March 31, at 8:30 a.m. in Room 3143. That concludes our meeting today. The meeting is adjourned [at 10:47 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Karri Hurwitz
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 442	C	Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB 442: Advance and Prompt Payment"
A.B. 442	D	Henry Rosas, External Affairs Manager, United Way of Southern Nevada	Document titled "Nonprofit Sector Analysis 2023"
A.B. 442	E	Various Individuals	A collection of letters in support
A.B. 442	F	Joseph Engle, CEO, There is No Hero in Heroin Foundation	Letter in support
A.B. 442	G	Brian T. Begay, Private Citizen, Las Vegas Nevada	Letter in support
A.B. 180	H	Antonio Ramirez, Government Affairs Director, Make the Road Nevada; and Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada	Proposed amendment
A.B. 180	I	Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB180"
A.B. 180	J	Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva, Assembly District No. 28	Collection of photographs of sidewalk vendors
A.B. 180	K	Ronald Najarro, State Director, Americans For Prosperity Nevada	Letter in support
A.B. 180	L	Eddie Diaz, Strategic Director, The LIBRE Initiative Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	M	Cristina Arroyo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada; and Sergio Galvan, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	N	Mariana Miranda, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	O	Cecilia Mendez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	P	Faridy Canales, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	Q	Marina Cerrano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support
A.B. 180	R	Gaudencia Torrez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written testimony in support

A.B. 180	S	Various individuals	Collection of written testimonies in support
A.B. 180	T	Alberto Leggs, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Email in support
A.B. 180	U	Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson	PowerPoint presentation titled "Statewide Business Licensing Workgroup"